



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,991	09/09/2003	Ridwan Shabsigh	0575/58075-Z/JPW/AJM/HA	4213
7590	12/04/2008		EXAMINER	
John P. White Cooper & Dunham LLP 1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036				KELLY, ROBERT M
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1633		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		12/04/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/658,991	SHABSIGH, RIDWAN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ROBERT M. KELLY	1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9,10,13-15,17-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9,10,13-15,17-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment and argument of 2/11/08 are entered.

Claims 9, 14, and 18 are amended.

Claims 12, 16, and 20 are cancelled.

Claims 9, 10, 13-15, 17-19, and 21 are presently pending and considered.

Claim Status, Cancelled Claims

In light of the cancellation of Claims 12, 16, and 21, all rejections and/or objections to such claims are rendered moot, and thus, are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 - Enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

In light of the amendments, the rejections of Claims 9, 10, 13-15, 17-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for lack of a fully enabled scope, are withdrawn.

To wit, the claims are limited to treating vaculogenic erectile dysfunction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

In light of the argument, the rejections of Claims 9, 10, 13-15, 17-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine, et al. (1996) Clinical Urology, 155(4): 1270-73 and U.S. Patent No. 5,652,225 to Isner, are withdrawn.

To wit, Gefen, et al. (2002) International Journal of Impotence Research, 14, 389-96, demonstrates that Peyronie's disease is not vasculogenic in nature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10, 13-15, 17-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,652,225 to Isner and U.S. Patent No. 6,100,286 to Lowrey, as further evidenced by Christ, GJ., (1995) Urology Clinics of North America, 22(4): 727-45.

At the time of filing, Isner teaches injecting VEGF encoding nucleic acids for inducing angiogenesis (e.g., CLAIMS), and include the teaching of plasmids encoding VEGF164/165 (e.g., FIGURE 5(b) and EXAMPLE 2).

Lowrey teaches that one such organ which suffers from vascular insufficiency is the penis (e.g., TITLE, BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION). Further, Lowry cites

several patents to demonstrate that one such tissue to be treated is the corpora cavernosa (e.g., Id.).

Still further, as admitted by Applicant, it was known at the time that of invention that a very common mechanism of erectile dysfunction was vascular insufficiency (Christ, GJ, cited in page 1 of the specification).

Hence, at the time of invention it would have been obvious to treat a subject suffering vascular insufficiency of the penis because one of the deficiencies erectile dysfunction is due to insufficient blood flow. Treatment could be accomplished by injection of the corporal tissue with plasmids encoding VEGF164/165. Knowing the affect of VEGF on angiogenesis, the Artisan would do so to treat the disease by increasing vascularization. Moreover, the Artisan would have a reasonable expectation of success, as Isner taught that upon delivery of VEGF that increased angiogenesis would occur.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT M. KELLY whose telephone number is (571)272-0729. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on (571) 272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert M Kelly/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633

/Joseph T. Woitach/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1633